

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 14, 25 and 26 are amended. Support for the amendments to independent claims 1, 14, 25 and 26 may be found on p. 36, line 21 - p. 37, line 16, for example. No new matter is added. A Request for Continued Examination is attached. Reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-6, 8 and 10-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0014488 to Dalal in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0220973 to Zhu, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,213,050 to Shaffer; and rejects claims 7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dalal, Zhu and Shaffer, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0178833 to Kisliakov. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Office Action asserts, on page 3, that Shaffer discloses priority levels for displaying or joining or retrieving a workspace or conference session (Fig. 5). Shaffer does not disclose that a prioritizer assigns priority based on at least one of the following pieces of information: (i) network information of a server; (ii) position information of the server; (iii) information regarding a name of the shared workspace, file name and URL received from the server; (iv) a user's schedule information and current time; (v) company user name information; and (vi) information indicating what shared workspaces were used in the past.

Shaffer discloses that conference reservations are adjusted based on a user's priority for the conference. That is, conference reservations are adjusted based on whether the user's priority is "high-priority" or "low-priority." Thus, Shaffer does not disclose that a prioritizer assigns priority based on the specific types of information recited in the pending claims. The other references are not applied in a manner that would overcome the above shortfall in the application of Shaffer to the subject matter of the pending claims.

In view of the above, the combinations of applied references would not have suggested the combinations of features recited in claims 1, 14, 25 and 26. Thus, the combinations of applied references would not have suggested the combinations of features recited in dependent claims 2-13 and 15-24, for at least the respective dependence of these claims on an allowable base claim, as well as for the separately patentable subject matter that each of these claims recites.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-26 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Kipman T. Werking
Registration No. 60,187

JAO:KTW/lmf

Attachments:

Petition for Extension of Time
Request for Continued Examination

Date: November 10, 2008

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 320850
Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--